

- 11 -

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 11 2007

REMARKS

The present response is to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on January 11, 2007 and Supplemental Office Action mailed on May 8, 2007. Claims 1-30 are standing for examination. Claims 1-18 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-18 of U.S. Patent No. 6,650,660. Remaining claims 21-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as U.S. Patent No. 6,650,660.

In response to the double patenting rejections applicant herein amends the claims to overcome both patenting rejections. Claim 1 now recites:

1. A method for processing packets of data comprising the steps of:
splitting each packet into a first portion and a second portion;
associating a first code with the first portion of data for each packet;
associating a second code with the second portion of data for each packet;
for each packet of data, storing the first portion of data, and its associated first code;
for each packet of data, storing the second portion of data and its associated second code; and
retrieving one of the first portions of data and its associated first code, retrieving one of the second portions of data and its associated second code, determining by the codes whether the first and second portions of data were generated from the same packet of data, and if the first and second portions of data were generated from the same packet of data, combining them to regenerate the packet of data.

Applicant points out that claim 1, as amended, claims a different process and structure using different components than what was claimed in Patent No. 6,650,660.

The Examiner has not asserted any other rejections against the claims presented in applicant's invention, therefore, claim 1 as amended is assumed by the applicant to be

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

- 12 -

MAY 11 2007

patentable over the double patenting rejections. Dependent claims 2-7 are patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended from a patentable claim.

Independent claims 11, 21 and 26 are herein amended according to the amendments of claim 1, therefore, these claims are also patentable over the double patenting rejections. Dependent claims 12-17, 22-25, and 28-30 are patentable on their own merits, or at least depended from a patentable claim.

As all of the remaining claims, as amended, have been shown to be patentable over the Examiner's rejections, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the case be passed quickly to issue.

If any fees are due beyond fees paid with this response, authorization is made to deduct those fees from deposit account 50-0534. If any time extension is needed beyond any extension requested with this amendment, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jeffrey A. Koehler et al.

By /Donald R. Boys/
Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency, Inc.
3 Hangar Way, Suite D
Watsonville, CA 95076
831-768-1755